



McTague, J. (2014). The *New Atalantis* arrests: a reassessment. *The Library*, 15(4), 439-446. <https://doi.org/10.1093/library/15.4.439>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):  
[10.1093/library/15.4.439](https://doi.org/10.1093/library/15.4.439)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)  
PDF-document

This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in 'Library' following peer review. The version of record [McTague, Library (2014) 15 (4): 439-446] is available online at:  
<http://library.oxfordjournals.org/content/15/4/439>

## University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

### General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:  
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

### The *New Atalantis* Arrests: a Reassessment

On 28 October 1709, the Earl of Sunderland, Secretary of State for the Southern Department, authorised an arrest warrant for two of the publisher-booksellers involved in the publication of Delarivier Manley's secret history *The New Atalantis*.<sup>1</sup> There are two documents recording this warrant, one rather more legible than the other, but both name 'John Morphew' and 'John Woodward'. These names were probably gleaned from the imprints of the numerous 1709 issues, but one of them contains a mistake. Woodward appears as 'J. Woodward' on imprints of Manley's book, his premises being 'in St. Christopher's Church-Yard, in Thread-needle-Street'. However, there is neither a bookseller nor a publisher named John Woodward active in this period. The J. Woodward on the imprint for *The New Atalantis* is James Woodward, who traded at St Christopher's Church Yard from c. 1705 to November 1710, when he moved to new premises in Scolding Alley before disappearing from the records in 1715.<sup>2</sup> James Woodward enters copies in the Stationers' Register between July 1710 and August 1715.<sup>3</sup> The only mention of a publisher named John Woodward in the bibliographic record for the period in question comes in the documents from Sunderland's office concerning these arrests.<sup>4</sup> That office made a mistake, and their information was incomplete in other ways: in the warrant book there is a blank space where Manley's Christian name should appear.<sup>5</sup> The authority and importance of these relatively recently discovered documents, of course, explains the now current expansion of 'J.' to 'John' in scholarship on Manley.<sup>6</sup> However, there is more at stake here than identification. The discovery of these documents has also shaped the narrative of Manley's arrest as it is recounted in criticism and biography from Ruth Herman's 2003 *The Business of a Woman* onwards. This is a central episode in Manley's life, and reassessments of it are frequently noted by reviewers.<sup>7</sup>

However, the manuscript evidence does not support that narrative as it stands. This article clarifies the content of these documents, their relationship to one another, and what they can tell us about Sunderland's department's attempts to locate Manley, her printer and her publishers in late October 1709. The first document, PRO, SP 44/78, is a warrant book belonging to Sunderland's office, which Rachel Carnell describes as 'newly discovered' in her 2008 biography of Manley (p. 143). Herman was not aware of this document in 2003.<sup>8</sup> The warrant book contains a copy of the arrest warrant for Morphew and Woodward, immediately followed by a shorter abstract recording a warrant for apprehending Manley and her printer John Barber, accusing them of the same offence, in 'the same words' (p. 65). The other document (PRO, SP 34/11, fol. 69) was described briefly by Herman in *The Business of a Woman*, and a portion of it transcribed. This document is a loose leaf, part of a collection of governmental letters, memoranda, and minutes of meetings, and written in the hand of Charles Delafaye, under-secretary to the Earl of Sunderland.<sup>9</sup> It reads as follows:

Secret Memoirs and Manners of Several persons of Quality of both Sexes from the New Atalantis an Island in y<sup>e</sup> Mediterranean.

John Morphew John Woodward

War<sup>t</sup> for apprehending these for ~~this & divers other~~ Scandalous Books particularly these To Jo. Chance. Tho. Smith & Fra. Elcock 28 Oct<sup>r</sup> 1709

D<sup>o</sup>. for apprehending blanks for y<sup>e</sup> cause as before.

for printing publishing \& dispersing/ several ~~false &~~ Scandalous Libels ~~containing~~ particularly one entituled the Rehearsal Revived containing many false & virulent \Reflexions &/ aspertions upon Her Ma<sup>ty's</sup> Government and tending to disturb y<sup>e</sup> peace thereof & alienate the minds of her Liege Subjects from the duty & Allegiance to Her Ma.<sup>ty</sup> &c.

11 Nov~ 1709.

‘Jo. Chance. Tho. Smith & Fra. Elcock’, are the three Messengers in Ordinary charged with apprehending Morpew and Woodward (they are named in the warrant book). The second paragraph on this page, beginning ‘for printing publishing \& dispersing/,’ is written in the same hand, though the script is much smaller. This may suggest that Delafaye hadn’t planned to put two such notes on the same page when he began writing, and in turn that these notes might not have been written in one sitting.<sup>10</sup> *The Rehearsal Reviv’d* was a short-lived periodical written by Edmond Stacey, apparently in continuation of Charles Leslie’s Jacobite paper *The Rehearsal* (Carnell, p. 181). This publication was suppressed by Sunderland, as H. L. Snyder showed in 1967.<sup>11</sup> A memorandum in the Blenheim MSS written by Sunderland’s agent and former Messenger of the Press John Gellibrand states that John Morpew was in custody on 14 November 1709 for his role in ‘publishing’ one or both of Stacey’s *Rehearsal Revived* and *General Postscript* (the latter was a ‘review’ periodical launched on 27 Sept 1709). Morpew was arrested along with Stacey, the printers John Leake and Edmond Powell, and fellow trade publishers John Baker and Benjamin Bragg.<sup>12</sup> Both publications ceased on 11 November, the date given in this note, and in Sunderland’s warrant book (Snyder, p. 328).

The deletions and interlinings on this page look very much like revision during composition.<sup>13</sup> Those revisions suggest that this page consists of draft warrants, all involving (but only one naming) John Morpew, and dated exactly two weeks apart.<sup>14</sup> In the context of the rest of the letters, memoranda and minutes collected in SP 34/11 this is a curious item: drafts of letters and minutes of meetings are usually written on the right hand side of sheets folded lengthways, so that the left half of the page can be used to insert revisions, additions, or clarifications.<sup>15</sup> Whilst this sheet does appear to have been folded lengthways, the notes are written over the fold. So, the writing on this sheet seems to be more ad hoc even than those rough versions of letters and minutes. The drafts relate precisely to their counterparts in the

warrant book.<sup>16</sup> The deletion of ‘~~this &~~’ and ‘~~other~~’ has the effect of accusing Woodward and Morpew of publishing ‘divers’ seditious works in the first place, and then *The New Atalantis* in particular. This reflects the arrangement of the warrant copied into SP 44/78, where they are accused of ‘having printed and publisht divers Books and Pamphlets [...] particularly two Books Intituled Secret Memoirs....’ (p. 64). Likewise, the copy of the warrant for *The Rehearsal Revived* on the previous page of the warrant book follows the draft and all of its interlined revisions word for word. All the evidence indicates that these notes are working material towards the warrants recorded in SP 44/78.<sup>17</sup>

There are a number of errors and omissions in Ruth Herman’s transcription of this loose leaf, most notably: misdating the first draft warrant to 11 November, referring to Woodward as Woodcock (and as a ‘printer’), and mistranscribing of the names of the three messengers Chance, Smith and Elcock.<sup>18</sup> Rachel Carnell’s reading of the note is also partial. She suggests that this ‘scrap of paper’ ‘probably refers’ to a warrant for *The Rehearsal Revived*, because it ‘does not specifically mention Manley, Barber, or *The New Atalantis*’ (p. 182). The ‘probably’ here is curious, as the draft very ‘particularly’ refers to *The Rehearsal Revived*.<sup>19</sup> Moreover, whilst Manley and Barber’s names are indeed absent, the first words on this page are the full title of *The New Atalantis*. Herman’s misdating of this draft opened up a gap of two weeks between Manley’s arrest and that of her publishers, who, it now seemed, had messengers sent to seek them out a few days after Manley had been admitted to bail (Herman, p. 73). For Herman this suggested that Manley might have informed on her publishers, contradicting the narrative in her pseudo-autobiographical *The Adventures of Rivella* (1714). In 2008, Carnell used the warrant book to corroborate Manley’s version of events, noting that the warrant for Morpew and Woodward is there dated 28 October.<sup>20</sup> Yet, as we have seen, the scrap of paper that Herman dated 11 November 1709 clearly dates the Morpew-Woodward draft warrant 28 October. Despite correctly dating Morpew and Woodward’s arrest, Carnell still thought that there was a ‘separate warrant’ relating to *The New Atalantis* dated 11 November (p. 273 n. 91). Dating the draft

Morphew-Woodward warrant in SP 34/11 to 11 November has introduced a ghost arrest into this episode in literary history. Correctly dating the first draft warrant clarifies our understanding of the relationship between these two documents, and allows us to concentrate on what it can reveal about the government's activities in pursuing those behind *The New Atalantis*, and other libels.

Woodward and Morphew are not arrested twice for *The New Atalantis*, but once, on 28 or 29 October. In *Rivella*, Manley's avatar claims that she was moved to surrender herself to the authorities upon hearing news of her publishers' arrests. The narrator Lovemore reports Rivella being quite clear that 'three Innocent Persons were taken up' while she was yet at liberty, and we know those three persons to be Morphew, Woodward, and Barber. Rivella is, as a consequence, heroically 'resolv'd to surrender her self into the *Messenger's* Hands, whom she heard had the Secretary of State's Warrant against her'.<sup>21</sup> This latter fact we can also corroborate, and we also have a one in three chance of correctly naming the messenger Manley would have encountered had she done so (Chance, Smith, or Elcock). It is quite possible, given that Luttrell reports the date of Manley's arrest as 29 October, that this is indeed the order things happened in.<sup>22</sup> This does not necessarily mean that Manley's publishers informed on her, though that possibility does remain. To think more pragmatically, it might reflect the fact that publishers—especially trade publishers—were rather more easily located, both because they will probably have been known to the government and because they print their addresses on their publications. Part of the function of a trade publisher like Morphew (and Woodward, if that is the hat he is wearing in this case) was precisely this: to be *more* locatable than authors, acting as a screen for printers, investors, authors.<sup>23</sup> That Sunderland's agent Robert Clare reported the address of John Barber to him in 1705 may have been a help to the messengers too.<sup>24</sup> So, the warrants for the arrests of Manley, Barber, Morphew and Woodward are dated on the same day, and that dating is witnessed by two independent documents, one of which is a draft in the hand of Sunderland's under-secretary.<sup>25</sup> Also significant is the fact that there are two entries for *The New Atalantis* in

the warrant book—and, I will suggest, in the drafts—and yet those two entries are clearly for the same offence, and issued on the same day. Why write two warrants? It seems reasonable to conclude that the warrant for Morpew and Woodward was already issued when the information about '[blank] Manley' and 'John Barber' came to the attention of Sunderland's office, whether through those publishers or other means.<sup>26</sup> There is a narrative to be extrapolated from these documents, but that narrative probably took place over a few hours, and not, as Herman and Carnell have suggested, a fortnight.<sup>27</sup> John Morpew is arrested on 11 November, with 5 others, for his involvement in two different publications. However, nothing relating to *The New Atlantis*, Woodward, Barber, or Manley happens on 11 November, so far as can be ascertained.

The last line of the first draft warrant helps us add some more detail to the processes of information gathering and authorising these arrests on or before the 28 October 1709. That line reads: 'D<sup>o</sup>. for apprehending blanks for y<sup>e</sup> cause as before'. It is a difficult line to transcribe, and even having done so its meaning is not immediately clear. The possibility that 'blanks' refers to printing-house material of some kind seems to be precluded by the verb 'apprehend'. That same verb also renders improbable the idea that 'blanks' here refers to a legal document with blank spaces for details to be filled in at a later date (even though that may be what is created as a result of this instruction).<sup>28</sup> The best explanation seems to be that 'blanks' here denotes a desideratum.<sup>29</sup> The line might be paraphrased thus: 'Ditto,' i.e. the same powers of arrest are conferred, for apprehending as yet unidentified persons for the same 'cause,' that is, *case*, or offence, as before.<sup>30</sup> It may seem odd to write 'blank,' rather than simply leaving a gap, but here this line is serving as a reminder or instruction to write up a warrant for the same offence, but with blanks left for the names of offenders to be inserted upon further information or their actual discovery.<sup>31</sup> This line—omitted by Herman and ignored by Carnell—provides a further link between this page and the warrant book, as the 'D<sup>o</sup>.' here seems to be reflected and slightly expanded in the note recording the warrant for [blank] Manley and John Barber, which also relies heavily on its immediate predecessor: 'Another Warrant directed to y<sup>e</sup> same three

Messengers as above to make strict & diligent Search in such places as they shall have notice for [blank] Manly & John Barber Printer being accused &c.<sup>a</sup> (in the same words as that above & of y<sup>e</sup> like date)’ (SP 44/78, p. 65). Such an interpretation of this line also helps us add one more stage to the narrative of Manley’s arrest. We know from the warrant book that on 28 October 1709, Sunderland’s department did not know Manley’s Christian name. We also know from the same source that they thought they knew the publishers of her book were, though they get one of their Christian names wrong too. This line in SP 34/11 indicates that at some earlier point—and quite possibly an earlier point in the same day—Charles Delafaye knew neither Manley’s name nor her printer’s. Yet he was prepared, should that information not be forthcoming, to issue a blank warrant so that a messenger could seek them out, as they were often asked to do. The word ‘blank’ in this draft warrant is a record of what Sunderland’s department knew they didn’t know for part of 28 October 1709. The discovery of Manley as author of *The New Atalantis* and the identification of Barber as her printer, then, appears to occur between the writing of SP 34/11, fol. 69 and the recording of the warrants in SP 44/78. It is possible that either Woodward or Morphew furnished this information, but Delafaye may have had other sources.<sup>32</sup> In the end, despite giving us an empty John for a James, the manuscript evidence relating to Manley’s arrest fully supports her account of the episode as it stands in *The Adventures of Rivella*.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See Rachel Carnell, *A Political Biography of Delarivier Manley* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008), pp. 180-182. The warrants, as is normal in such cases in this period, are for both arrest and search.

<sup>2</sup> Woodward’s earliest extant publication is *Brotherly Love Recommended* (London: Printed by E.P. for J. Woodward, in St. Christophers Church-yard in Threadneedle-street; and are sold by J. Nutte near Stationers Hall, 1705), advertised in *The Daily Courant* for 5 January 1705. *A Compleat Volume of Memoirs for the Curious* is advertised as being sold by Woodward in St. Christopher’s Church Yard in the *Post Man and Historical Account* on 16 November 1710; an advertisement for



---

the first part of Ned Ward's paraphrase of *Don Quixote* appears in the *Evening Post* on 28 November 1710, sold by Woodward 'in Scalding-Ally'. The latest advertisement I have found for Woodward at Scalding Alley is in the *Post Boy* for 9 June 1715; he disappears from ESTC and the Stationers' Register in this year too.

<sup>3</sup> Woodward registers copy for 19 books, and there are records of his shares in two books entered by others. Of those 19, he owns the whole share of 9. Several are signed for by 'James Woodward' but bear 'J. Woodward' on their imprint (For example, Edward Ward, *The Tipling Philosophers* (London: for J. Woodward, [1710]) (ESTC T60813), entered by James Woodward on 16 August 1710. Private information from John Chalmers, who is transcribing the Stationers' Register from 1710-1746 (Stationers' Company, Stationers Hall, Entries of Copies 28 April 1710 to 25 Sept 1746, p. 61, item 4). Woodward's copies appear on the following pages of the register (the latter number indicates the entry number on that page; references to this volume of the register will hereafter take the form SR 061/04): 053/02; 061/04; 071/01; 077/06; 085/03; 086/04 [entered by Arthur Bettsworth]; 093/03 [entered by Thomas Norris]; 097/03; 107/02; 107/03; 120/03; 133/06; 147/03; 166/07; 185/04; 187/03; 199/02; 199/03; 199/04; 212/07; 229/01.

<sup>4</sup> No John Woodward appears in the Stationers' Register until 1726, and then it is the physician and antiquary John Woodward registering the copyright for Benjamin Holloway's translation of his *The Natural History of the Earth*. (SR 339/02; J. M. Levine, 'Woodward, John (1665/1668–1728)', *DNB* <doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/29946>)

<sup>5</sup> PRO, SP 44/78, p. 65. Warrants with partial or missing names are found throughout this warrant book (see pp. 5, 13, and 69). The warrant book is a departmental record of warrants authorised by the Secretary of State, those entries not necessarily being true copies of the official documents themselves (see Priscilla Scott Cady (assisted by Henry L. Cady), *The English Royal Messengers Service, 1685-1750*, Studies in British History, 56 (Lewiston; Queenstown; Lampeter:

---

The Edwin Mellen Press, 1999), p. 50). For a 1703 warrant that appears to have been folded and carried about by a messenger (and bears traces of a wax seal) see PRO, SP 34/2, fol. 52.

<sup>6</sup> Sunderland's misidentification has been accepted as the norm following the publicising of a note relating to the arrests in Ruth Herman, *The Business of a Woman: The Political Writings of Delarivier Manley* (Univ. of Delaware Press, 2003), p. 73. Carnell refers to Woodward as John throughout her biography. Ros Ballaster's edition of *The New Atalantis*, published before Herman in 1991, stuck to the imprint's 'J'; her *DNB* entry, postdating Herman, calls Woodward John (Delarivier Manley, *The New Atalantis*, ed. by Ros Ballaster (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1991), p. vi; Ros Ballaster, 'Manley, Delarivier (c.1670–1724)', *DNB* <doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/17939>).

<sup>7</sup> Ros Ballaster singles out Herman's discovery of this document and its impact on our understanding of Manley's arrest in her review of *The Business of a Woman* (*The Review of English Studies* 56 (2005), pp. 323–325, p. 324). Carnell's treatment of this episode, particularly her use of the 'newly discovered' warrant book, was also noted favourably in reviews: see, for instance, Katharine Beutner's review in *Women's Writing* 17 (2010), pp. 196–198.

<sup>8</sup> Priscilla Scott Cady does refer to Sunderland's warrant book briefly in her (admittedly specialist) 1999 study of the Messengers in Ordinary (Cady, pp. 57–58).

<sup>9</sup> Compared with a letter in Delafaye's hand to Erasmus Lewis, dated 28 July 1705 (PRO, SP 89/18, fol. 216), and a 1709 letter from Delafaye to Sunderland (PRO, SP 34/10 fol. 235). These two documents (especially the latter) are written with rather more care than the draft warrants, but Delafaye's '8' and 'y<sup>e</sup>' are good points of comparison.

<sup>10</sup> It is otherwise difficult to account for the drafting of two warrants, unless Sunderland or Delafaye were planning a postponed response, dealing with *The New Atalantis* first, and then the *Rehearsal Reviv'd*, being conscious of Morpew's involvement in both cases.

<sup>11</sup> H. L. Snyder, 'The Reports of a Press Spy for Robert Harley: New Bibliographical Data for the Reign of Queen Anne', *Library*, 5<sup>th</sup> series, 22:4 (1967), pp. 326–45, p. 328. The author of the

---

*Rehearsal Reviv'd* is identified as 'Mr. Stacy,' and the paper's suppression reported, in a letter from Thomas Smith to Thomas Hearne dated 10 December 1709: 'The Author of the Rehearsal revived & the general Postscript, one Mr. Stacy, has layd their villainous designs against the Monarchy & Church open: w ch made them mad and foame at the mouth: and they were restless, til they got the poor man taken up, and his papers suppressed' (Bodleian Library, MS Smith 62, fol. 595).

<sup>12</sup> The warrant book also names Lewis Hurst, mentioned in the memorandum reported by Snyder, but not one of the 6 men in custody on 14 November; Gellibrand there says that 'Complete setts of both were left at Mr. Hurst's in black & white court in the old Bayly to sell for the author; at which place the author own'd and justifi'd the two above mentiond Libels and that he writ and corrected & caus'd to be printed and publish'd the same' (SP 44/78, p.63; Snyder, p. 328).

<sup>13</sup> Note the deletion of 'containing' so the clause 'particularly one entituled the Rehearsal Revived' can come before the description of these libels' seditious tendencies.

<sup>14</sup> There is a draft for the warrant granting Thomas Earl of Wharton the governorship of St. Laurence's Hospital in Cirencester on fol. 84.

<sup>15</sup> For minutes, see fol. 107, and for a draft letter, fols. 101-102.

<sup>16</sup> The warrant for the *Rehearsal Revived* and other libels is at PRO, SP 44/78, p. 63, those for Manley, Barber, Morpew and Woodward on p. 64. Though the warrant book is arranged in broadly chronological order, there are times when that order is disrupted, perhaps because warrants were sometimes recorded in batches, periodically (see pp. 8-9, for instance).

<sup>17</sup> We cannot say for certain that these documents reflect precisely the warrants carried by the messengers, but it is difficult to imagine a scenario where Delafaye would take the trouble of revising the form of words as he wrote if this were not a draft of the warrant proper.

---

<sup>18</sup> Herman's transcription runs as follows: "The note records the warrant for the arrest of John Morphew and John Woodstock, the publisher and a printer. It reads: "Nov. 11 1709. Secret Memoirs and Manners of Several Persons of Quality of both Sexes from the New Atalantis, an Island in the Mediterranean. John Morphew, John Woodward. War[rant] for apprehending these[?] for printing[?] Scandalous Book, particularly [?] Jo. Charw [?] Thos. Smith & Fla Shock[?]" (p. 73). Herman has transposed the date at the bottom of this page (or that on its reverse) to its beginning without explanation.

<sup>19</sup> "particularly one entituled the Rehearsal Revived..." (SP 34/11, fol. 69).

<sup>20</sup> Carnell's transcription from SP 44/78 on p. 180 of her book also contains orthographic mistakes.

<sup>21</sup> Delarivier Manley, *The Adventures of Rivella* (London, 1714), p. 109.

<sup>22</sup> Luttrell's account does suggest he thinks the arrests were made on the same day (29 November), but it could equally be the day he received the news: "The publishers and printers of a late book, called the New Atalantis, which characterises several persons of quality, are taken up, as also Mrs. Manley, the supposed author' (Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs*, 6 vols. (Oxford: The University Press, 1857), VI, p. 505).

<sup>23</sup> The character of Woodward's imprints suggests that he was a trade publisher, and Carnell treats him as such. As noted above, however, he does register copies in the Stationers' Register and does so rather more often (proportionally speaking), than his occasional partner John Morphew. The latter enters 29 items in his own name in the Stationers' Register, and ESTC returns over 1600 hits for a search for 'Morphew' as publisher (Michael Treadwell, 'London Trade Publishers 1675-1750,' *The Library*, 6<sup>th</sup> ser., 4 (1982), pp. 99-134, pp. 116-117). Woodward enters 21 copies, with only 127 hits on ESTC for 'J. Woodward' or 'James Woodward'. Moreover, two publications whose imprints declare the works to be 'printed, and sold by' J. Woodward and J. Morphew are in fact wholly owned by Woodward, according to the register

---

(*The Practice of Devotion: or, a treatise of divine love* (London: printed, and sold by James Woodward, in St. Christopher's Church-Yard, near the Royal Exchange; and John Morphew, near Stationers-Hall, 1710) (ESTC T80697; SR 053/02) and Ned Ward, *The field-spy: or, the walking observer. A poem.* (London: printed: and sold by J. Woodward; and J. Morphew, 1714) (ESTC T35514; SR 185/04)). This cannot prove that Woodward was an investor in *The New Atalantis* (Carnell plausibly suggests John Barber (p. 162)), but neither is it certain that he was simply a distributor.

<sup>24</sup> Snyder, p. 336. With appropriate caution, Carnell tentatively suggests that Manley and Barber *may* have been living together in 1709 (there is no firm evidence until Swift's mention of his visit to their house in 1711) (p. 143).

<sup>25</sup> Carnell states that the 'second warrant' in Sunderland's warrant book is undated (but 'may have been issued on the same day'). However, there is no question: it clearly states that Manley and Barber are 'accused &c. (in the same words as that above & of *y<sup>e</sup> like Date.*)'. Carnell quotes all but the last five words of this sentence (Carnell, p. 162; 180; SP 44/78, p. 65 (my emphasis)).

<sup>26</sup> Both warrants are directed to the same three messengers, so the division of warrants here is not a division of labour.

<sup>27</sup> That the location of those responsible was considered a matter of some urgency is suggested by the assigning of three messengers to the task (see Cady, p. 56).

<sup>28</sup> *OED* Blank *n.* 6 .a. 'A document, "paper," or "form" with spaces left blank to be filled up at the pleasure of the person to whom it is given (*e.g.* a blank charter), or as the event may determine; a blank form'.

<sup>29</sup> This is something akin to *OED* Blank, *n.* 12 a) 'A dash written in place of an omitted letter or word. Thus, — — — Esq. of — — — Hall, read *Blank Blank* Esquire of *Blank* Hall,' though admittedly the reading I am proposing is rather specific to this context.

<sup>30</sup> *OED*, Cause, *n.* II. 7. a) Law. 'The matter about which a person goes to law; the case of one party in a suit'. Cause may also be being used here more broadly as 'reason'.

---

<sup>31</sup> Cady suggests this as an explanation for the numerous records of warrants with missing information: 'It is also possible that the Messenger-searcher did his hunting first and then filled in the name of whomever he found who fit the general description' (p. 50). In this period before the institution of anything like a modern police service, and before John Wilkes and the printers of the *North Briton* successfully challenged the legality of the general warrant used in their apprehension, Secretaries of State felt no legal obligation to name particular persons and places in warrants. The details that were present in warrants were perhaps more to do with instructing messengers as to who and / or what they were being asked to secure in any given case. For more on the legal history of 'general warrants,' see R. Thomas Farrar, 'Aspects of Police Search and Seizure without Warrant in England and the United States,' *University of Miami Law Review* 29 (1975), pp. 491-558, esp. pp. 550-558.

<sup>32</sup> That all four people named in the warrant were required to appear at Westminster Hall, and did so at 'a very great Expence,' according to *Rivella*, suggests at least that no-one successfully traded information for immunity (p. 115).

<sup>33</sup> 'Curl stretches after Gay, but Gay is gone, | He grasps an empty Joseph for a John'. (Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad in Four Books*, ed. by Valerie Rumbold (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2009), p. 163).